

**JOINT SERVICE DEPOT MAINTENANCE CONFERENCE
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
11-13 APRIL 2000**

MINUTES

11 April 2000

1. **Opening Remarks.** Mr. Lee Lord, the Navy Maintenance Interservice Support Management Officer (MISMO), opened the conference and welcomed all the attendees. He thanked his staff and those at SPAWARSYSCEN San Diego and Joint Depot Maintenance Activities Group (JDMAG) for their hard work in supporting this conference. He introduced Mr. Dan Solan, SPAWARCEN San Diego, who seconded the welcome, speaking on behalf of CAPT John Graham, who was unable to attend. Before kicking off the conference with the keynote speech, Mr. Lord recognized the contributions of two depot maintenance interservice personnel who would be retiring soon: Mr. Joe Cupurdija, Army Material Command, and Mr. Ralph Cannon, Sacramento Air Logistics Center.
2. **Keynote Address.** RDML Tony Lengerich (OPNAV/N43) provided a thought provoking keynote speech. He started off by asking and postulating on answers to the following questions, “What will the world be like in 2020? What will be the threat to our nation then? How can we as individuals and our country as a whole best prepare for it?” He addressed a number of interesting facts that will influence the future. Foremost was the fact that we are flat age-wise in the United States. We are procuring fewer, but very expensive and highly sophisticated weapon systems. We will have to be extremely selective in deciding where those systems get deployed. Competition and global markets will be influential. The trend toward international partnering to develop, procure, and manufacture interoperable systems will also be a factor. The use of forward deployed forces and out-of-country technology and support capability will help shape the future of our weapons support including the infrastructure, and ultimately, determine the future of the organic depots.
3. **Action Item Review.** Mr. Joe Cupurdija (Army MISMO Staff) reviewed the status of the six action items from the 1998 conference in Corpus Christi. Action items 4, 5, and 6 were closed. Action item 1, concerning problems resulting from implementing the Distribution Standard System (DSS), is being resolved through Interservice Material Accounting and Control System (IMACS). Items 2 and 3 involve longstanding interservice problems: receiving credit for repairables turned in; and, non-using service depots requisitioning items to support interservice workload. A new group, the Joint Group on Material Management (JG-MM), under the Joint Logistics Commanders (JLC), has been tasked to work these. The JG-MM approach to resolution will be provided at the June JLC meeting.
4. **Joint Depot Maintenance (JDM)/Depot Maintenance Interservice (DMI) Organization.** Representatives from each of the Services, the Defense Logistics Agency, and the Joint Depot Maintenance Activities Group (JDMAG) presented briefings on their current organizational structures that support JDM/DMI:
 - a. **JDM/DMI Organization Overview.** Mr. Larry Rutledge (JDMAG) led the series by presenting the overall JDM/DMI structure and interrelationships of various groups and organizations.

He started the structure from the top with the JLC. Mr. Rutledge touched on the JLC philosophy and purpose and on their relationship with OSD (through the Defense Depot Maintenance Council). From the JLC the chain led to its chartered subgroup, the Joint Group on Depot Maintenance (JG-DM), covering the JG-DM mission and functions, including their membership (comprised of members from the various Service commands). JDMAG, a chartered subgroup of the JG-DM, is the fulltime, service-staffed organization that supports the JG-DM and the JDM Program. Directly under the JG-DM are the Services' working level interservicing networks to include the MISMOs, MISOs, and depot personnel. Mr. Rutledge briefly touched on the responsibilities of the MISMOs, Joint Advisory Board (JAB), and MISOs.

b. **Army Organization.** Mr. Joe Cupurdija (Army MISMO staff) addressed the Army's overarching structure, depot maintenance (DM) policy proponents, DM Corporate Board, and all their major players and functions. He then addressed the hierarchy and responsibilities of their logistics/operations chain down to the Maintenance Management Division (MMD) at AMC and their subordinate interservice network. Particular emphasis was placed on the MMD functions, where the MISMO staff resides; finally on to the rest of the DMI personnel, their locations and functions.

c. **Air Force Organization.** Lt Col George Forest (Air Force MISMO representative), presented the Air Force's organization, beginning with their DM Division at AFMC where the MISMO resides, and the subordinate, dual chain consisting of: 1) their JAB member and interservice study support in their Contract DMAG Branch; and 2) their MISO personnel at their ALCs. He then discussed responsibilities of the ALC MISOs for the following functions: DMI studies, DMISAs, and Depot Source of Repair (DSOR)/Source of Repair Analysis Process (SORAP). At all ALCs except WR-ALC, the MISOs perform these functions. In the case of WR-ALC, these functions are split between the MISO and another office. He ended with the note that DSOR recommendation/nomination is done as part of the SORAP.

d. **Navy Organization.** The Navy's JDM/DMI organization was discussed by Mr. Charles Buono (Navy MISMO staff). Mr. Buono began the organization at the Navy JLC member level, progressing down the chain to the three JG-DM members (one each at NAVAIR and NAVSEA and one at OPNAV); from there to the MISMO resident at NAVAIR as the lead systems command in the Navy for JDM/DMI; finally to the MISOs at NAVAIR, NAVSEA, SPAWAR, NAVSUP, NAVFAC, NAVICPs Mechanicsburg and Philadelphia. Mr. Buono indicated that only the Navy uses the term Maintenance Interservice Coordinating Offices (MICOs) to identify their depot DMI functional personnel. He ended with a brief coverage of DMI personnel responsibilities.

e. **Marine Corps Organization.** Mr. John Wolfe (Marine Corps MISMO) presented the Marine Corps JDM structure, beginning with their JLC member at MARCORMATCOM. He proceeded down the chain to: 1) MARCORLOGBASES where their JG-DM member is located and on to the MISMO/JAB and MISO in the Maintenance Directorate, and subordinate depots at Albany and Barstow; 2) MARCORSYSCOM consists of their acquisition program offices and life cycle management center.

f. **DLA Organization.** Mr. Bob Tomasik (DLSC) provided an overview of DLA's organization, indicating that realignment is still ongoing. The Defense Contract Management Command (DCMC) is

no longer part of DLA. It is now a separate agency, the Defense Contract Management Agency, reporting directly to OSD. The Director, Logistics Operations (J3), formerly the Defense Logistics Support Center (DLSC), has been re-integrated into DLA HQ and is responsible for business management and logistics policy within DLA. The Defense Distribution Depots report to the Defense Distribution Center.

5. OSD Maintenance Policy Update. Mr. Hollis Hunter (OADUSD/MPP&R) provided an update on the following topics:

a. “50-50” Report to Congress – GAO is currently auditing the FY98-99 data. The Services and Defense agencies are in compliance with 10 USC 2466. Outyear projections were due 1 April.

b. The Depot Maintenance Core Capability Requirements Audit - This two-phased audit is being conducted by Pricewaterhouse Coopers in partnership with LMI. Phase one validated the Services’ core processes. Phase two is underway. In this phase, major workloads will be used to walk through each step of the Core Methodology, identify effects of Title 10 variations, integrate and cross-level common capability requirements into a quantified DoD Core requirement, and develop DoD policy and methodology recommendations. ECD: October 2000.

c. Public-Private Partnering Report for DM - This report was published and sent to Congress 1 Oct 99 in place of a report required by Section 361(c) of FY98 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The House Appropriations Subcommittee exhibited substantial interest in the content that catalogs a substantial number of partnerships undertaken by the Services under existing statutory and regulatory authorities.

d. DM Capacity and Utilization Measurement - Per a recent DoDIG report, the Services have significant shortcomings in implementing DoD 4151.18-H (Capacity Handbook). The PDUSD (A&T) memo of 30 Sep 99 provided clarifying supplemental handbook instructions and directed full implementation.

e. FY 01 Legislative Proposal - This proposal, now defunct, would have allowed work performed at government facilities, whether by contract or organic personnel, to be counted as organic work under 10 USC 2466 (the “50-50” report).

f. FY 00 NDAA, Public Law 106-65 – DM Related Provisions - Covered various depot maintenance related provisions (sections 331, 332, 333, 334, 344, and 911) under public law 106-65 of the FY 00 NDAA.

6. Depot Source of Repair (DSOR) Process. This topic was covered by a series of briefings on the DSOR Process. Service representatives addressed their views/procedures on the contract vs. organic source of repair determination, i.e., Core Methodology application. JDMAG addressed the Depot Maintenance Interservice (DMI) Study Process.

a. **NAVAIR Process.** Mr. Lee Lord provided an overview of this process addressing the initial and final core determination steps, the depot nomination process, and the interface with the DMI

process. He touched on statutory considerations (Core, 50/50 and the 3 million dollar competition requirement). Ms. Nancy Turner (NAVAIR) then provided an overview of Core, its history, statutory and regulatory guidance, and NAVAIR's interpretation of Core. She stated that Core is a capability (artisans, equipment, facilities) that must be preserved through the performance of specific workload in support of JCS scenario requirements. All the Services are required to conduct core determinations under Title 10, Section 2464 (10USC2464) using the DoD Core Methodology logic process. Ms. Turner provided the key points and exclusions/considerations of the 1998 NDAA on 10USC2464. Under this change, the focus of the core determination shifted from the risk associated with performance of workload in the private sector to whether or not the hardware associated with that workload met the criteria for a "commercial item" or a "commercial item with minor modification." If an item is required to sustain core capability NAVAIR explores the possibility that adequate capability may already exist in public depots. If so, the associated workload is subjected to a best value analysis. Otherwise the DoD Core methodology is strictly adhered to in all other respects. If the item is commercial and capability exists, then core capability is not required. The item would be designated as non-core. However, all non-core items undergo a best value analysis to determine whether the item should be supported commercially or organically.

b. **Air Force Process.** Lt Col George Forest indicated that Core capability equals skills, facilities, and people. The Air Force looks at block F2, risk assessment as a 2 step process, a repair base assessment and a risk analysis. He addressed factors under risk assessment and their associated weights. They look at several risk levels: if rated as a high risk, then organic capability is the outcome; with low risk, the outcome is non-core, but a best value analysis would be performed to determine the organic vs contract determination. He also addressed who conducts these analyses and the extensive approval process in the Air Force.

c. **Army Core Process.** Mr. Joe Cupurdija (AMC) indicated that maintenance engineers at their major subordinate commands, in support of their program offices, perform the Core analysis, using a flow chart based on: the JCS scenario, peacetime direct labor hours, estimate of scenario workload, trade skills, best value analysis and other factors. He indicated that Core is performed in conjunction with the DSOR review process, but within the purview of the Army PEOs. The Core analysis and accompanying risk analysis is presented at Milestone II Army Systems Acquisition Review Council. From AMC's perspective, problems encountered with the Army's Core process include: there is no central oversight of the process; there is no review (validation) of the Core analysis outcome; and, the analysis is not performed IAW guidance. Finally, Mr. Cupurdija concluded that dialogue between AMC and the PMs are needed. He referenced the 1999 Army depot maintenance policy memorandum and stressed the need for interface between the acquisition and logistics sides of the Army chain.

d. **DMI Study Process.** Mr. Larry Rutledge (JDMAG/MAU) provided an overview of the DMI studies process. His briefing covered the four situational DMI reviews, directed depot source of repair (DSOR), Service workload competition, MISMO review, and JDMAG DMI study. He discussed the conditions under which each situational review is conducted as well as the processes followed. Mr. Rutledge also provided an overview of the DMI Implementation Tracking process, the current Joint Depot Maintenance (JDM) Program regulation, the Acquisition Personnel Guide, and the Defense Acquisition Deskbook.

7. **National Center for Manufacturing Sciences (NCMS).** Mr. Kerry Barnett (NCMS) described the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) Program. In this program, the NCMS consortium provides technologies for demonstration, while the maintenance depots provide the validation sites. The briefer explained the agreement between OSD and the NCMS consortium is that consortium matches government dollars on a two-to-one basis. He also described who participates and how the program works. The process for establishing projects starts with a concept paper that identifies a proposed project and provides a cost-benefit analysis. Projects are ultimately submitted to OSD, who has ten days to either accept or decline the project. To date projects with a collective value of almost \$10M have been established. Ten DoD maintenance depots have participated in the program. Specific projects were identified as well as future opportunities for collaboration.

8. **Field Activity Support and Technology Transfer (FASTT) Program.** Mr. Gary Smith (JDMAG/MAW) described FASTT as a joint program of the Commander in Chief Pacific Fleet , Commander in Chief Atlantic Fleet, NAVSEA, NAVAIR, NAVFAC, AFMC, and the Army Environmental Center. The program is unique because it focuses DoD-wide expertise to meet the environmental and maintenance process challenges that face the Services today. The FASTT Team was created to provide technical support to assist the field in pollution prevention, waste reduction, cost and labor savings and increase mission efficiency and effectiveness in job completion. The team provides the field activities with opportunities for improving maintenance actions through site visits and technology recommendations by FASTT Team technical experts. FASTT site surveys are concentrated efforts of short duration that focus some of the best talent in the military on solving maintenance and environmental challenges. Emphasis is placed on finding, developing, and implementing only those material substitutions, work process changes, and technology acquisitions that will not increase the burden on the serviceman. All FASTT team site surveys are scheduled through activity Environmental Offices. Once an activity and/or region is selected, a small team visits the activity to conduct a pre-survey. Four to ten weeks following the pre-survey, the FASTT team arrives for a one/two-week site survey (depending on the size of the activity/region). At the exit briefing with the activity Commanding Officer, the Team provides a written report targeting opportunities for maintenance process improvement, waste reduction, and cost avoidance. Follow-up site visits are scheduled to help the activity implement the opportunities. This continuous support and dialog are hallmarks of the FASTT program.

12 April 2000

9. **PICA-SICA Regulation Update.** Mr. Clark Yarbrough (NAVSUP MISO) provided an update on this regulation (AMC-R 700-99/NAVSUPINST 4790.7/AFLCR 400-21/MCO P4410.22C). Mr. Yarbrough is the Navy member of the Nonconsumable Integrated Material Management Committee (NIMMC). He indicated the NIMMC is rewriting this regulation and needs assistance from the DM community for a new chapter 8, "Depot Maintenance." Mr. Yarbrough requested the identity of Service POCs to work on this chapter. The MISMOs provided the names of their Joint Advisory Board members as the initial POCs to contact. The Navy MISMO requested that the final draft be staffed with the MISMOs because this regulation contains MISMO responsibilities and is a companion to the JDM regulation.

10. **Interservicing Depot Requisitioning and Credit Policy**. Service representatives presented the status on how their service is working/resolving these two interservicing problems.

a. **Navy**. Mr. Clark Yarbrough (NAVSUP) provided the following information:

(1) **DoDAAC Table**. Navy ICPs will soon have a procedure in place to handle other services' depot requisitioning of Navy managed parts. This summer they expect to activate use of a DoDAAC Table to support DMISA workloads. The table would also automate processing of credit for carcass turn in. With this table in place, there will no longer be a need for another service to register as a user for a part that is only needed to support DMISA work. This table has already been tested satisfactorily at Letterkenny Army Depot.

(2) **Project Codes**. There were new project codes to use for identifying interservice work and specific support requested by the principal, e.g., Code 3BB identifies an item for repair and placement in stock. DLA recognizes and responds to these codes. The attendees were unaware of the existence of these codes; many of them indicated that if they had known about them and used them, it would have saved considerable time and trouble. Mr. Yarbrough agreed to provide an updated list of project codes to the attendees.

(3) **CAV II/DOD CAV**. Use of DoD CAV as a means of providing asset visibility to interservice customers is a real possibility. He indicated that CAV was currently used to track assets at commercial repair activities using the contract number and therefore might be used similarly for DMISA assets using the DMISA number. NADEP Jacksonville volunteered to be the first test case. He asked that the IMACS PM explore potential use of WEB CAV and promised to provide a web address to the attendees to obtain further information.

b. **Air Force**. Mr. Bob Wiese (Air Force MISMOstaff) indicated the following:

(1) **Air Force Solutions/Processes**. Stated that NIMSC 5 credit problems had been fixed last summer. He also discussed the use of 3AB, 3AD, 3AL and 3BB project codes. He presented 2 flow charts on the Air Force's interservicing requisitioning procedures, from the perspectives of the Air Force as Principal and as Agent.

(2) **DLA**. Some of the attendees indicated that with DLA handling shipping, receiving, and storing of interservice repairables, there were additional problems to overcome than when the Services were performing those functions. Lt Col Forest stressed that all codes (project, signal, fund, and asset condition) must be correct to ensure a successful outcome.

c. **Army**. Ms. Rilla Nameth, Army JAB, after presenting a background/history on attempts to resolve these long standing interservicing issues, provided the following information:

(1) **Army Resolution Expectation**. LEAD and CCAD are using both automated and manual workarounds—the procedures and workarounds are different depending upon the depot and the customer (Air Force or Navy). She added that the Army doesn't expect a standard solution. They do, however, feel that these problems have been going on too long. The DMISA work is increasing for the

Army, so it is of paramount importance that they be able to deal effectively with each Service. She commented that she was heartened by hearing about the project codes and the Navy's DODAAC table. However, she was concerned that the Army Agents/depots had not been advised about these. She encouraged the Army MISOs to ensure their input for the DODAAC table was provided. *Subsequent to the meeting, both Navy ICPs indicated that the DODAAC tables were built based upon the current list of other Service depots doing DMISA work.*

(2) **JG-MM Tasking.** Ms. Nameth mentioned that a new group, the Joint Group on Material Management (JG-MM), had been tasked by the JLC with solving these long standing issues. The JG-MM had been instrumental in this tasking. Mr. Ken Ellis (JDMAG) provided additional insight. He stated that the JG-MM would probably be forming a subgroup to work the problems and report back to the JG-MM/JLC on progress. Mr. Ellis also told the audience that they could access the JLC Feb 00 meeting minutes on the JLC home page to see the tasking and to determine who their Service JG-MM representatives were. The JG-MM were tasked to provide their approach to resolution at the next JLC meeting currently scheduled for June 00.

11. **Distribution Standard System (DSS).** Mr. Larry Loiacono (DLA/DLSC) briefed on the business rules, design, and procedures for DSS. He also addressed DSS receiving capabilities, emphasizing the use of pre-position material receipt data (PMRD) documents. Exact DSS procedures depend upon the Service and the depot. DLA doesn't handle repairables for Navy depots, those go direct to the depot. Navy depots use DLA for transshipment only. He stated that although repair parts are co-mingled, the Service's repairables are separated. A point was made that the Navy uses purpose codes in lieu of ownership codes that the Air Force and Army uses. Mr. Loiacono discussed DLA's support capability in the following areas: inventory/item data, Preservation, Packing, Packaging, and Marking, workload planning, hazardous materiel packaging and transportation, and transshipment. DLA developed software to translate the Service's legacy systems non-standard language to "MILS" for DSS processing through the DAAS. They are currently using bridging for the Army and Air Force systems. He covered procedures for Air Force and Army DMISAs.

12. **Interservice Material Accounting and Control System (IMACS) Challenges and Solutions.** Ms. Barbara Machenheimer (IMACS PM) began by acknowledging the hard work of the Configuration Management Team (CMT). There are several user challenges: 1) lack of Marine Corps funding/participation and the associated impacts; 2) training deficiencies, indicating the progress made by TRW in providing on site user training and training planned; and, 3) DMISA loading progress. She stressed that all Services except the Marine Corps have made tremendous progress in loading FY 00 DMISAs and that both the Principal and Agent must load data to make IMACS useful in terms of DMISA negotiation and asset visibility. System challenges include: 1) deployment of feeder systems and their working status; and, 2) the interface between DSS and IMACS. The DSS/IMACS ICD interface is in final coordination. Service unique support requirements will be included. Ms. Machenheimer stated that user satisfaction continues to be of primary importance. They are looking at relaxing a number of production reporting business rules, the use of EXCEL files produced by TRW for production reporting and planning, and automating input versus manual input via ASCII files. As far as system performance, problems are monitored and reported to the PMO and CMT members. There is also the use of discrepancy reports and the IMACS help desk. She addressed: future functionality improvements; feasibility and costs of IMACS as a web-based application, and satisfying DoD

architecture requirements. She concluded with a summary of the support and actions needed of the customers, Service leads, and the PMO.

13. **OSD DMISA Survey Results** Mr. Chuck Field (OADUSD/SCI) provided the results of the DMISA customer satisfaction survey conducted by OSD. The purpose of the survey was to get an indication of the “health” of the Depot Maintenance Interservicing (DMI) program. A two-part analysis was conducted. The first part consisted of a customer service phone survey with MISOs and program managers. The survey focused on the following areas: (1) timeliness, price, quality, and overall satisfaction; (2) comparison to industry and own service; and (3) future plans. The second part consisted of a detailed data analysis on the nine largest FY 97 workloads. The analysis made comparisons between reported depot costs and the negotiated prices; between negotiated and actual flow days, and finally, addressed DMISA price trends. The results of the survey showed that the DMI program is basically acceptable. However the customer service opinions did not always agree with the objective performance metrics. This may be because those who write the DMISAs are not those who experience the results of the DMISA execution. The customers determine performance acceptability based on whether their needs are met, while the program manager determines acceptability based on metrics in the agreement. These points of reference may not always be the same. Another conclusion of the survey is that there are no voluntary initiatives to interservice additional workload, even though there may be other opportunities. If there were no constraints in depot assignment/decision process, a substantial number of customers would shift work back to their own service or to industry despite satisfactory customer service responses. Mr. Field emphasized that this survey is just a snapshot in time. The important point from this exercise is that depots must aspire to be the “provider of choice.”

14. **OSD DMISA Survey Follow-up** Tom Gorman (JDMAG/MAW) reviewed the results of JDMAG’s follow-up on those DMISAs that were rated as outstanding, poor, or unsatisfactory in the original OSD survey. This follow-up had been directed by the JG-DM. Customers on the outstanding DMISAs commented on the depots’ commitment to customer service and good communication. On one of the two poor DMISAs, the customer reported that all problems had been resolved. The other poor DMISA included repairs for both a major platform and components. On this program, the customer was mainly concerned with turn around time. Platform overhauls are taking too long. For components, the depot prefers to spread workload throughout the year rather than accomplishing requirements as they generate. For this DMISA, JDMAG contacted the Agent Service for comments. They acknowledged some problems with platform turn around time, attributing some of the blame to a ceiling placed on the depot work force. In regard to spreading component work, they feel that this is a reasonable way of ensuring a smooth flow of work through the depot. For both platforms and components, the Agent would like to have more accurate projections from the customer, and better adherence to the schedule, both in terms of generation of requirements and submission of funding. Problems with the unsatisfactory DMISA included poor accounting for both funds and assets, as well as an overall unresponsiveness to customer concerns. The fact that the workload transferred from a depot closed by BRAC to a gaining depot soon to be closed by BRAC may have aggravated the situation. The briefer also noted that JDMAG was tasked to repeat the survey on a biennial basis, meaning that another survey would be conducted this fall. He requested suggestions on how to go about the survey. Considerations include which DMISAs to survey, who to contact and what types of questions to ask. One person stated that the MISOs need to be involved regardless of who is contacted. It was also suggested that field users be contacted to determine if the DMISAs, as written, address their needs.

15. **Improving DMISA Customer Service.** Ms. Anita Lopez (Navy JAB) and Mr. Tom Gorman (JDMAG/MAW) were co-moderators of this session designed to solicit ideas for improving DMISA customer service. The intent was to capture and share these ideas within the DMI community and for future DMISA support personnel. The results of the session would be reported to the JG-DM who had expressed interest in its outcome. The session consisted of employing panelists representing the Principal and Agent/depot perspectives of DMISA support and encouragement of audience participation. The panelists were: Mr. Frank Cosby (OC-ALC), Mr. Curt Aussicker (CECOM), Mr. Bill Jimenez (NADEP Jacksonville), Ms. Sally Rake (TYAD), and Ms. Carolyn Gsell (NAVICP-P). Suggestion forms that had been filled out by the attendees were used by the panelists to solicit ideas. Each of the panelists presented their perspectives on DMISA support before the moderator began working with the questions and answers on the suggestion forms and soliciting ideas through the interaction of the panelists with the audience. The co-moderator captured the ideas on paper and summarized those at the end of the session. The moderator stated that all of the survey responses would be reviewed by the MISMOs' staffs, together with the session outcome, to determine JG-DM presentation material and to decide on any further actions needed.
(See attachment 1, for detailed session notes.)

16. **Hot Technologies.** Mr. Steve Siens (JDMAG/MAW) presented a briefing on "Hot Technologies" currently transitioning into the joint depot maintenance community. These technologies were given visibility to the joint depot maintenance community through the Joint Technology Exchange Group (JTEG). JTEG meeting format, themes, Service principals and web pages were also highlighted to demonstrate how these technologies are transitioned across service lines. Specific technologies addressed included: safe acid cleaning, laser cladding, hi-tech welding helmet, next generation transparencies, flash-jet paint stripping, lactate ester paint stripping and cleaning, enhanced circuit card inspection, super critical CO2 spray coating application, and appliqué verses paint. The "Hot Technologies" briefing as well as complete briefings on the technologies identified above can be found on the JDMAG web site. This site also contains information for the depot maintenance community on upcoming JTEG meeting dates and locations.

13 April 2000

17. **JDMAG Web Site.** Ms. Cynthia Underwood (JDMAG/MAW) reviewed the structure and content of the JDMAG web site. The site (www.jdmag.wpafb.af.mil) contains more than 1.2 MB of data. It currently consists of nearly 600 files and 5700 hyperlinks. In the first quarter of Y2K the site received 33,468 hits, which is more than 5 times the number of hits for the same time period last year. Approximately 58 percent of those hits were from military users. Ms. Underwood provided the following information on the three major categories on the home page:

(1) "About JDMAG" offers general information about the organization, including its background, personnel, location and structure; (2) "Products" lists publications that are actually produced by JDMAG personnel; and (3) "Popular Items" is a collection of significant items to which many people in the depot maintenance community need access. Finally, the briefer opened up selected portions of the web site to illustrate the variety of information available. Specific pages reviewed included the Joint Depot Maintenance Regulation, the Depot Maintenance Business Profile, and the Depot Profiles.

18. **MISMO Round Table.** The Service MISMOs and the DLA representative addressed questions submitted from the attendees during this session. There was considerable interest in addressing communication problems within the interservicing community. The discussions centered on: (1) procedures the MISMOs might undertake to promulgate decisions or to share items of interest to the community, such as, the status of resolving interservicing requisitioning problems; and, (2) methods of improving informal lines of communications with the MISMOs or possibly JDMAG as the initiator/collector/distributor of timely information. A number of questions were raised that involved the commitment/role/participation of DLA in the DMISA process. A question regarding the correct wording in the JDM regulation, Appendix F, concerning the Principal's responsibility to furnish common and peculiar support equipment was discussed. As a result of these and other discussions during this session, a number of action items were assigned. These are summarized on the action items listing at attachment 2.

19. **JDM Training/Orientation.** Mr. Les Campbell (JDMAG/MAU) provided information on the two current Joint Depot Maintenance (JDM) Program training courses available from JDMAG: the Depot Maintenance Interservice Support Agreement (DMISA) course and the Cost Comparability Handbook (CCHB) course. He outlined the contents, target audience, and media for each course. Additionally, he provided details of the Acquisition Personnel Guide available from JDMAG. Finally, Mr. Campbell covered how prospective students could enroll in one of the JDM courses and how to obtain a copy of the Acquisition Personnel Guide.

20. **Partnering/Teaming Initiatives.** Service representatives presented perspectives on this topic and also provided examples of their initiatives.

a. **Army.** Mr. George Moore (USAMC/AMCLG-LM) reviewed the statutory basis for the Army partnering initiatives, specifically 10 USC 2474, as well as Army policy which mandates pursuit of partnering and teaming in order to make efficient use of organic capability. The Army's overall depot maintenance strategy is based on retention of three organic depots that will maintain skills and workload sufficient for the Army to go to war, to include pre-deployment, deployment and reconstitution of equipment. Specific types of partnering/teaming arrangements employed by the Army include facilities use contracts, direct sales and work sharing agreements. As specific examples, the briefer highlighted the Abrams Integrated Management XXI Program and the M1 to M1A2 Upgrade Program.

b. **Air Force.** Lt Col George Forest, (HQ AFMC/LGP) reviewed three areas in which the Air Force is pursuing partnering arrangements. These included the Depot Maintenance Business Area (DMBA), Supply Management Business Area (SMBA) and the Product Support Business Area (PSBA). Under DMBA, the Air Force pursues both direct sales and leasing agreements. Under SMBA and PSBA, arrangements provide for either total contractor or government support, as well as arrangements where either the contractor or the government serves as an integrator. In the DMBA area, major considerations for any partnering initiatives include the impact on 50/50 posture and Core. SMBA partnering determinations are based on the Air Force Supply Management Strategy. PSBA functions (other than acquisition positions) are often considered for A76 studies. The briefer then reviewed the current status of the following projects being pursued under the authority of 10 USC 2553: C-17 ACI, LANTIRN Phase II, C-17 Landing Gear and F100-PW229. LB 99-7 partnering initiatives are being considered for F-16, Space Based Infrared System, B-1, C-5, F-117, KC-135, Cheyenne

Mountain, E-3 AWACS, E-8 Joint Stars and C-17. The overall AFMC partnering vision stresses compliance with all strategies and inclusion of all stakeholders. DMBA Core Capacity will be fully utilized and Core capabilities will be maintained.

c. **Marine Corps.** Mr. John Wolfe (MARCORLOGBASES/Code L22) began his briefing by stating that the Marine Corps currently has one major partnering initiative underway—the Amphibious Assault Vehicle (AAV) Reliability, Availability and Maintainability (RAM) Program. Under this arrangement, UDLP performs hull modification and provides technical and administrative support, while the Marine Corps Maintenance Centers accomplish disassembly, repair/installation of upgraded components, and reassembly. This \$300M arrangement maximizes the strengths of both partners and minimizes hull mod cycle time.

21. **Automatic Identification Technology (AIT).** Mr. Maurice Stewart (HQ DLA) gave a briefing on AIT. DLA is the executive agent for AIT. AIT is a suite of technologies that enable the automatic capture of source data, thereby enhancing the ability to identify, track, document, and control materiel, maintenance processes, deploying forces, equipment, personnel and cargo. Although AIT is not new, its use has been expanded as part of the logistics technology evolution and the need for real-time situational awareness to better support the needs of our warfighters. Its objectives are to facilitate source data collection, improve data accuracy, enhance asset visibility, and reduce logistics processing time. Ultimately, the goal is worldwide implementation. He discussed various technologies and their applications: two dimensional barcode, radio frequency identification and data communication, optical memory cards, contact memory buttons, satellite tracking systems, and smart cards. Mr. Stewart also discussed AIT efficiencies, comparing times between old and new (AIT) methods. AIT has the potential to bring numerous resource and mission benefits to the maintenance activities. Effective use of maintenance AIT can support a number of broad DoD goals including: improving maintainer productivity, reducing total ownership cost, and increasing operational readiness.

22. **Workforce Revitalization.** Mr. Billy Bickerstaff (ANAD) discussed Anniston Army Depot's approach to revitalizing its workforce. He provided background on ANAD as the center of technical excellence for the M1A1 Tank. He then provided ANAD's workforce profile (personnel split, white and blue collar workers, average age and salary, etc.). The challenge is: their aging workforce requires wholesale replacement in the next five to ten years, so they want to encourage people to leave, but ensure they can be replaced with sufficiently skilled personnel to maintain their mission. Their worst fear is the major drain of core skills, like mechanics, welders, and painters. ANAD sees this loss as a critical situation that could seriously impact their mission. Their approach is to develop a five-year staffing plan for critical occupations and then begin actively recruiting. This requires analyzing the existing workforce for potential job fills (under merit promotions or internship/co-op programs) for technical skills. The difficulty is enticing people into these "core" skill occupations, since experience has shown that these blue collar positions are not considered attractive by potential hires at the high school or vocational school levels. Their plan includes establishing an on-site co-op program (under OPM guidelines); contracting with the local schools for training coordinators and instructors; and, partnering with local vocational colleges so the students may obtain dual enrollment credit. Their aim is to provide hands-on training at ANAD for 30 students per year. They have a mechanism to convert these co-ops from trainees to journeyman level positions without the need for further competition. The projected cost of this program over five years is \$2.3M.

23. **Closing Remarks**. After Ms. Anita Lopez (Navy MISMO staff) recapped the action items, Mr. Lee Lord, briefly addressed the audience. He thanked everyone associated with supporting the meeting and indicated that he felt the meeting had been successful. Mr. Lord then closed the meeting.